

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                    | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/781,158                         | 02/17/2004     | Juan C. Colberg      | PC10856B                | 6044             |
| 7:                                 | 590 12/21/2004 |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
| Thomas A Wootton                   |                |                      | BERCH, MARK L           |                  |
| Pfizer Inc<br>301 Henrietta Street |                |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
| Kalamazoo, MI 49007                |                |                      | 1624                    |                  |
|                                    |                |                      | DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary                         |  | 10/781,158   | COLBERG ET AL.   |  |  |  |
|   |  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |  |  |
|   |  | Mark L. Berch  | 1624   |  |  |  |
| Period fo                                     | The MAILING DATE of this communication apported by Reply   | pears on the cover sheet with t  | he correspondence address  |  |  |  |
| THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | I36(a). In no event, however, may a reply by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS a, cause the application to become ABAND | be timely filed ) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |
| Status  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1)[   | Responsive to communication(s) filed on  | <u>_</u> .   |  |  |  |  |
| 2a)⊠  | This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This   | s action is non-final.   |  |  |  |  |
| 3)  | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposit                                      | ion of Claims  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5) <u></u><br>6)⊠                             | Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or   | wn from consideration.   |  |  |  |  |
| Applicat                                      | ion Papers   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9)🖂   | The specification is objected to by the Examine  | er.  |  |  |  |  |
| 10)[  | 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Applicant may not request that any objection to the  | drawing(s) be held in abeyance.  | See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |  |  |  |
| 11)   | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex  |  | ·  |  |  |  |
| Priority (                                    | under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a)  | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list   | s have been received. s have been received in Applic<br>rity documents have been rece<br>u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).   | cation No eived in this National Stage   |  |  |  |
| Attachmen                                     | t(s)   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | e of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) 🔲 Interview Summ  | nary (PTO-413)   |  |  |  |
| 2) 🔲 Notic                                    | e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Ma   | il Date  |  |  |  |
|   | mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/29/2004</u> .  | 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:  | nal Patent Application (PTO-152)   |  |  |  |

Art Unit: 1624

#### DETAILED ACTION

#### Restriction

Although a telephone restriction was initially made in this case, on review of the parent application, it is seen that the restriction was withdrawn in the parent application, and hence is not being made in this case. All claim are examined.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraphs 1 and 2, as the claimed invention is not described, or is not described in such full, clear, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the same, and/or failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention. Specifically:

The claim 1 process, as written, will not produce the product as specified, and hence the claim is not correct (paragraph 2). Alternatively, the specification does not teach how to do this process (paragraph 1). The problem here is the XH in the final product of Formula 1. Example 1 exactly corresponds to the claim 1 process language, including the PCl<sub>5</sub> treatment at page 27, lines 26-27. The product, however, does <u>not</u> correspond to Formula 1 because the HX is <u>not</u> present. No other example gives the

Art Unit: 1624

Formula 1 product either. The Bateson et al. reference, doing the N-deacylation on a virtually identical compound (differing only in the nature of the ester group at a remote point) does not directly obtain the salt. Either the structure of Formula 1 is not correct, or something has been left out. If the examples fail to produce the product, the claims are not enabled, *Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co.*, 28 USPQ2d 1190.

In responding to the rejection, applicants must first decide for themselves whether or not they believe that claim 1 is correctly written, i.e. whether they intend that claim 1 be a process giving a process with HX present. If applicants decide that the claim is not correctly written, they must amend the claim, being careful not to introduce new matter. If applicants decide that the claim is correctly written, applicants must explain the discrepancy between the process as set forth in the claim, with HX present, and the process as set forth in example 1 of the specification and also in Bateson, with HX not present. That is, since the specification teaches that this process gives a process with HX not present, a process with HX present cannot be deemed enabled. When operativeness has been properly challenged, it is incumbent on applicant to limit the claims accordingly, cf. *In re Harwood*, 156 USPQ 673, *In re Cook*, 169 USPQ 298, *In re Langer*, 183 USPQ 288, *In re Corkill*, 226 USPQ 1005, 1009, and *In re Rainier*, 153 USPQ 802. The fact that the specification itself teaches that this process gives a product with HX not present presents a proper challenge to the operativeness of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to

Art Unit: 1624

be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-15, 25, 28-39, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateson et al (US-6,001,997).

The claim 1 process is embraced by the teaching of the reference at column 11, line 41-column 12, line 19. Converting the product to a salt appears as step v) at line 65, making the salts referred to at column 2, line 20. The p-nitrobenzyl choice for R3 (for claim 28) appears at column 3, line 17, and allyl (for claim 29) is at line 18 and benzyl (for claim 30) is at line 16. The actual examples use the p-methoxybenzyl ester (e.g. 6, 13-15) or the butyl (example 1). The equivalence of the groups is clearly taught at column 3, lines 16-18, where all 5 groups are mentioned. Applicants need to show that unexpected effects arise from the use of one protecting group rather than another. Similarly, the p-methoxybenzyl and butyl esters of the 7-amino compounds of examples 1, 3, 6, 13-15 render claim 32 obvious. These fall within Formula II, differing only in the carboxyl protecting group, which is obvious for reasons set forth above, and being in the salt form, a variation taught by column 9, line 29. In the same manner, the phenylacetamido intermediate of claim 33 is rendered obvious by the intermediates at example 6, step d; example 13, step e; examples 14-15, step d. This differs solely in the nature of the carboxyl protecting group.

Claim 2's toluene is seen in e.g. example 1, step e; example 3, etc. Claim 3's use of PCl<sub>5</sub> is seen in e.g. example 1, step f; example 15, step e, etc.

Claims 4 and 7 deal with the process of preparing the starting material IIIa, converting the alcohol IIIc to the halide IIIb, and reacting that with the phosphine. That

Art Unit: 1624

appears in the reference at column 12, lines 22-48. This is exemplified in example 1 and other examples. Claim 8's thionyl chloride appears at column 18, line 38, and claim 9's lutidine appears at line 40. Claim 25's THF appears at column 12, line 41. Claim 34 is thus obvious, as such compounds are made in Example 1, step c and d; ex 3, steps d and e, example 6, steps b and c, etc. This compound has a different protecting group present, but that is obvious for reasons set forth above in the discussion of the R3 equivalences at column 3, lines 16-18, of methoxybenzyl with nitrobenzyl and allyl.

The claim 10-12 process is set forth at column 13, lines 27-50, including the use of acetone as solvent.. See examples 6, step b. The thiol intermediate at column 25, lines 29-31 renders claim 35 obvious. This compound has a different protecting group present, but that is obvious for reasons set forth above in the discussion of the R3 equivalences at column 3, lines 16-18, of methoxybenzyl with nitrobenzyl and allyl. The compound is also made in examples 14-15, step b, although it is not named there, and is made in example 27, step e.

Claims 13-15 deal with the method of preparing the thiol by cleaving the fused thiazoline compound VIa. The reference states that the thiol can be made "according to known methods" and cites specifically the Narisada method, at column 14, lines 58-62. See example 6, step b and examples 14, 15, 27, 29 etc step b. Similarly, the product of example 6, step b) renders obvious the compounds of claims 36-39. These compounds have a different protecting group present, but that is obvious for reasons set forth above in the discussion of the R3 equivalences at column 3, lines 16-18, of methoxybenzyl with nitrobenzyl and allyl.

Art Unit: 1624

The traverse presented in the parent was unpersuasive. Applicants raised three arguments:

A. Unexpected improvement in terms of "better isolation and purification." However, evidence of unexpected effects should have been presented in the form of a proper declaration under 35 USC 132. The arguments of counsel cannot take the place of factually supported objective evidence. See, e.g., In re Huang, 100 F.3d 135,139-40, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1689 (Fed. Cir. 1996); In re De Blauwe, 736 F.2d 699, 705, 222 USPQ 191, 196 (Fed. Cir. 1984). "The reason for requiring evidence in declaration or affidavit form is to obtain the assurances that any statements or representations made are correct, as provided by 35 U.S.C. 25 and 18 U.S.C. 1001." (MPEP 716.02(g)).

B. Applicants next argued that their protecting group can be removed with sodium dithionate, and under "mild pH adjustment" whereas the prior art protecting group cannot. However, removing protecting groups is a well understood area, a routine matter, and these are all expected differences, not unexpected ones. Expected differences are not evidence of unobviousness, In re Gershon, 372 F.2d 535, 538, 152 USPQ 602, 604 (CCPA 1967); Ex parte Blanc, 13 USPQ2d 1383; In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Incidentally, applicants statement that utilization of paramethoxybenzyl requires the use of Palladium is untrue. Hydrogenation is a common method, but such groups have been removed by other methods, such as formic acid, or TFA.

C. Higher yields are possible with pNB in the next step. Again, no proper evidence for this has been presented.

Art Unit: 1624

## Specification

The abstract is objected to. It states that there is a process, but gives virtually no indication of what that process consists of. The amendment tendered in the parent is suggested.

This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 10006579. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mukund Shah can be reached on (571)272-0674. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 1624

Page 8

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0198.

Mark L. Berch Primary Examiner Art Unit 1624

December 20, 2004